

March 14th 2013
Legislative Office Building
Hartford, Connecticut

To all honorary committee members,

I am here today to express my opposition to SB 1076. I would like to share in the simplest terms why this piece of legislation is flawed.

In the last few weeks we were told that a bi partisan commission looked into every possible avenue and option in reducing gun violence, that these were our brightest and best minds figuring it out how to make Connecticut a safer state. My question is this, where is the research to back measures in SB 1076?

Publicly we've seen a few staged demonstrations by the Connecticut State Police (as seen on CPTV) which cannot be considered objectionable as the State Police is operating directly under Governor Malloy who already has made up his mind (a person who admits not knowing much about firearms and has yet to present any evidence to substantiate his claims).

The state police demonstration was directly related to the issue of magazine capacity. The idea that was being sold is that less bullets equal more reloads, which equal longer time to fire the same amount of bullets. In reality, magazine capacity doesn't make a difference how many bullets are fired during a mass shooting. All mass shooters plan the event ahead of time. They use vests, extra pockets or other clothing fashioned to hold extra magazines. When equipped with a vest or other magazine carrier, reloading takes seconds. If we are to even look at the event in Newtown, Adam Lanza didn't even use his entire magazines as there are reports of magazines laying on the floor with bullets in them. This only proves the point that when you have multiple magazines on your person magazine capacity is a non issue. The only factor at this point would be how much ammo can the person carry. What ever that number is it makes no difference if its held in 5 magazines or 10 magazines, again going back to Newtown, the criminal at hand would reload prior entering a new area, taking breaks between firing at non critical times, such as before entering a new area, his reloads would have happen regardless of how many bullets his magazine held. Just for the record handgun reloads can be done in under 2 seconds, yet this part was left out by the state police demonstration.

So if magazine capacity doesn't make a difference in mass shootings what would be an application were it would prove to be a benefit? What about a home invasion? If you're a firearm owner and you are a subject of a home invasion by multiple attackers, you most likely won't have time to access additional magazines or ammunition during such incident. How about if you're a clerk at a convenience store and 2 armed intruders enter the store with guns. They will bring what ever un registered unlicensed gun with a banned magazine they can get their hands on, while the clerk has just 10 rounds. Even if they happen to have 10 rounds, thats 2 gunman, 20 rounds, and the good guy the clerk on 3rd shift with just 10. How does SB 1076 help that clerk?

In conclusion I like to take the last scenario to the next level. If this commission is really interested in reducing violence where is the audit of all of the shootings from our largest cities in the state? Of all the shootings between Hartford, Bridgeport and New Haven how many empty "hi capacity" magazines were recovered at the crime scenes? The fact that the commission hasn't even bothered to collect such information makes it clear and obvious that the true focus of SB 1076 is to suppress legal gun owners rights more then it is about public safety. Criminals by definition will not comply with the law, which leaves only the law abiding citizens with the burden of compliance, registration, fees, permits and documentation, which none will prevent another criminal from using a weapon to commit a crime and nothing the commission has produced proves otherwise.

Lastly, yesterday on March 13th it was announced that the town of Newtown has found money to fund police officers to man its school (with guns that have high capacity magazines). If the victims of such tragic incident have determined that armed security is in its best interest why hasn't this commission come to the same conclusion?

Regards

Martin Wiosna